



153

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

Public Copy

File: WAC 98 216 50847 Office: California Service Center Date:

JUN 18 2001

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Outstanding Professor or Researcher pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(1)(B)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

Identification data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy.

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Acting Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is a manufacturer of electronics, measuring equipment and computers. It seeks to classify the beneficiary as an outstanding researcher pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(1)(B). The petitioner seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a software design engineer. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary is recognized internationally as outstanding in his academic field, as required for classification as an outstanding researcher.

8 C.F.R. 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part:

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

On the Form I-290B Notice of Appeal, filed on March 2, 2000, counsel indicated that a brief would be forthcoming within thirty days. To date, fifteen months later, careful review of the record reveals no subsequent submission; all other documentation in the record predates the issuance of the notice of decision.

The statement on the appeal form reads simply "[a]lien beneficiary qualifies for this classification under 8 U.S.C. § 230(b)(1)(B) [sic]." This is a general statement which makes no specific allegation of error. The bare assertion that the director should have approved the petition is not sufficient basis for a substantive appeal. Inasmuch as counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

We note that the petitioner filed another petition on this beneficiary's behalf, with receipt number WAC 00 139 52227. This petition was approved on June 13, 2000, and the beneficiary has applied for adjustment to permanent resident status. It is not clear whether the filing and approval of this second petition contributed to the petitioner's evident decision not to pursue this appeal, but in any event the petitioner has now obtained the classification it sought for the beneficiary, and this matter would therefore appear to be moot.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.